

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided on October 25, 2004, for the acknowledgement of Applicant's Claim of Priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document, and for the acknowledgement of consideration of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filed March 9, 2004 by return of an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 submitted therewith. Nevertheless, Applicant notes that the Examiner has not initialed the Form PTO-1449 adjacent the English language abstract of the Japanese document. While it is presumed that the Examiner considered the English abstract when considering the underlying document, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner initial the Form PTO-1449 adjacent the English abstract and return a copy of the initialed Form PTO-1449 to the Applicant with the next official action.

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-2 will have been amended, further, new claims 3-4 will have been added. Thus, claims 1-4 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejection, and allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

On page 2 of the Official Action, claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by H.DE BOER (US 3,460,876). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for the reasons that follow.

The Examiner asserted that the H. DE BOER disclosed "one protrusion formed on the guide rails..." Applicant cannot agree with this assertion because reference numeral 36 in Fig. 2 of H. DE BOER is a track (36) having a substantially V-shaped cross section, not a rail (see lines 42-49, column 2 of H. DE BOER), and there is no equivalent to the protrusion of the presently claimed invention in the disclosure of H. DE BOER. Reference numerals (38, 40), which were indicated by the Examiner as protrusions in the Official Action, show the surfaces of the track, not protrusions (see lines 51-53, column 2 of H. DE BOER). Further, the Examiner is requested to consider the tension element (50) of H. DE BOER. The element (50) is not a generally rigid protrusion formed on the guide rail, but is a resilient attachment positioned on track (36) (see lines 54-60, column 2, 15-25, column 3, and Figs. 3-7 of H. DE BOER).

To clarify these above differences, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include, *inter alia*, " one generally rigid protrusion formed on each guide rail to allow...." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 1 is not proper.

In the same light as claim 1, claim 3 has been newly added, reciting a further feature of the present invention, " at least one protrusion formed unitarily and in one piece on..." which is neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art. Further, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2 and 4, which are at least patentable due to their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 3 for the reasons noted above, recite additional features of the present invention and also separately patentable over the prior art of record.

For the above noted reasons, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1 and 2 is not proper, and that claims 3 and 4 are also patentable over the applied prior art. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection, and provide an early indication of the allowability of claims 1-4.

CONCLUSION

Entry and consideration of the present amendment, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action, and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate. Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they have now done so.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this Response, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to be for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should there be any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Seong-ryong PARK

William E. Lyddane William E. Lyddane
Bruce H. Bernstein Reg. No. 41,568
Reg. No. 29,027

January 25, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191